

1 Frank E. Scherkenbach (CA #142549)  
2 *scherkenbach@fr.com*  
3 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
4 One Marina Park Drive  
5 Boston, MA 02210-1878  
6 Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
7 Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

8 Michael R. Headley (CA SBN 220834)  
9 *headley@fr.com*  
10 Neil A. Warren (CA SBN 272770)  
11 *warren@fr.com*  
12 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
13 500 Arguello Street, Suite 500  
14 Redwood City, CA 94063  
15 Telephone: (650) 839-5070  
16 Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

17 Attorneys for Defendant  
18 POWER INTEGRATIONS, INC.

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA,**  
**SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

16 OPTICURRENT, LLC

17 Plaintiff,

18 vs.

19 POWER INTEGRATIONS, INC.,

20 Defendant.

CASE NO. 3:17-cv-03597-WHO

**POWER INTEGRATIONS'**  
**PROPOSED VERDICT FORM**

When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please follow the directions provided throughout the form. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in detail in the Jury Instructions. Please refer to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below.

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

## **I. INFRINGEMENT**

- Has Opticurrent proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Power Integrations literally infringes claim 1 of the '623 patent? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Opticurrent. A "NO" answer is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Please check the boxes that reflect your verdict.

<b>Literal Infringement</b>								
	LinkZero-AX Products		LinkSwitch-II Products		TinySwitch-LT Products		TinySwitch-III Products	
	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>Claim 1</b>								

- If you answered "NO" for any product(s) in Question 1, has Opticurrent proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the accused Power Integrations products nevertheless infringe claim 1 of the '623 patent under the doctrine of equivalents? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Opticurrent. A "NO" answer is a finding for Power Integrations.) **If you answered "YES" for any product(s) in Question 1, you may skip this question as to those product(s).**

Please check the boxes that reflect your verdict.

<b>Doctrine of Equivalents</b>								
	LinkZero-AX Products		LinkSwitch-II Products		TinySwitch-LT Products		TinySwitch-III Products	
	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>Claim 1</b>								

- 1 3. Has Opticurrent proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Power  
2 Integrations induces infringement of claim 1 of the '623 patent?

3 (A "YES" answer is a finding for Opticurrent. A "NO" answer is a finding  
4 for Power Integrations.)

5 Please check the box that reflects your verdict.

6 **YES**

**NO**

7 [ ]

[ ]

9  
10  
11 **II. INVALIDITY**

- 12 4. Has Power Integrations proven by clear and convincing evidence that claim  
13 1 of the '623 patent is anticipated and therefore invalid?

14 (A "YES" answer is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer to  
15 this question is a finding for Opticurrent.)

16 Please check the box that reflects your verdict.

17 **YES**

**NO**

18 [ ]

[ ]

- 19  
20 5. Has Power Integrations proven by clear and convincing evidence that claim  
21 1 of the '623 patent is obvious and therefore invalid?

22 (A "YES" answer is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer to  
23 this question is a finding for Opticurrent.)

24 Please check the box that reflects your verdict.

25 **YES**

**NO**

26 [ ]

[ ]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

6. Has Power Integrations proven by clear and convincing evidence that claim 1 of the '623 patent is invalid because of a lack of enablement? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Opticurrent.)

Please check the box that reflects your verdict.

<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
[    ]	[    ]

7. Has Power Integrations proven by clear and convincing evidence that claim 1 of the '623 patent is invalid because of inadequate written description? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Opticurrent.)

Please check the box that reflects your verdict.

<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
[    ]	[    ]

(If you answered "Yes" to any of Questions 1-3 AND you answered "No" to each of questions 4-7, continue to Section III. If you answered "No" to Questions 1-3 OR you answered "Yes" to any of questions 4-7, then skip Section III and sign / date the form as provided at the end.)

**III. DAMAGES**

8. What amount in reasonable royalty damages did Opticurrent prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to for any infringement?

\_\_\_\_\_

You have now reached the end of the verdict form and should review it to ensure it accurately reflects your unanimous determinations; you must each sign this Verdict Form. The foreperson should then notify the Courtroom Deputy that you have reached a verdict. The foreperson should retain possession of the verdict form and bring it when the jury is brought back into the courtroom.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

_____ (foreperson)	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Dated: December 21, 2018

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

By: /s/ Michael R. Headley  
Michael R. Headley

Attorneys for Defendant  
POWER INTEGRATIONS, INC.